

Sincere thanks to both community members for their comments on this work. The comment is in normal color, while the [answer is in blue](#).

Community comment 2

Dear Nathan, dear all,

First of all, thanks a lot for making this nice and important study available to the community!

1. Purpose of this short comment is just to address the aspect of the community engagement in the acquisition of the underlying datasets. Many of the measurements used in your study were only made available by special funds. Specifically, ATMO-ACCESS should be mentioned here. E.g., "The preparatory work for EarthCARE validation has been supported by the European Commission under the Horizon 2020 – Research and Innovation Framework Programme, through the ATMO-ACCESS Integrating Activity under grant agreement No 101008004." But also the ACTRIS funds provided by the individual member countries are very relevant, as, e.g., TROPOS/Leipzig would not be able to run any 94GHz radar without the ACTRIS-D funds. E.g., for TROPOS: "ACTRIS-D is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space (BMFTR, formerly the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), grant no. 01LK2001A) under the FONA Strategy "Research for Sustainability". See, e.g., the more community-driven approach of the EarthCARE ATLID Cal/Val study of Baars et al. (2026): <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2026-1490>. I also see other ACTRIS funding numbers missing, e.g., for the Basta calibration campaigns.

Overall, the investments don't get visible in your study, even though they were the prerequisites for the used datasets (and partly provided solely for the sake of EarthCARE Cal/Val). Unfortunately, they also don't become visible by just pointing to the Cloudnet database (as it is done in the discussion manuscript). Here, I further suggest to use the option of the Cloudnet web portal to create individual DOIs for each dataset you were using. The CLU Team can support with that, or you just select a site & date range -> select "download" --> "create DOI".

I would appreciate if you could extend the acknowledgements accordingly, so that the activities underlying your study can be tracked appropriately.

[Thanks for pointing out this issue. We had a discussion with the ACTRIS CCRES head office to promptly modify the acknowledgments. We also generated a doi for both the ground and satellite dataset.](#)

[Changes to the manuscript: Acknowledgments were modified. Added the DOI of the datasets in the data availability.](#)

2. A small final additional comment (while I leave the actual review to the reviewers): It would be nice to list the date range of evaluation already in the abstract (and not just in Tab. 1). This might become a relevant aspect with increasing temporal extent of the EarthCARE dataset.

Changes to the manuscript: The date range of the study was added to the abstract. Line 9